

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/600,890	08/16/2000	Seiji Shirai	P19797	6628
7055 7	590 02/13/2004		EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.			DINH, TUAN T	
1950 ROLANI RESTON, VA	O CLARKE PLACE 20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2827	
			DATE MAILED: 02/13/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

• ·	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	v
Advisory Action	09/600,890	SHIRAI ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
γ ⁻	Tuan T Dinh	2827	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 20 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	THIS APPLICATION IN CONDI	TION FOR ALLOWANCE. ation. A proper reply to a	d
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official of the control of the con	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEI R 1.136(a) and the appropriate ext unt of the fee. The appropriate ex-	ension tension on: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	•	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying	the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE:		,	
 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 		eparate, timely filed amendm	nent
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set	reconsideration has been cons e Continuation Sheet.	idered but does NOT place	the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	□ will be entered and an w or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5-12,14-19 and 21-36</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer O. Other:	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)[_	ISthitehead &	
		CARL WHITEHEAD, JR. ERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER ECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800	
		CHITCHOLD CLITTEN ZOUD	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant argues the rejection of claim 11 under 112, second paragraph is not proper. Examiner disagrees. Since the limitation of "a depression...the through hole" in claim 11 has been already said in claim 9, lines 5-7 (claim 11 depending of claim 9), so that examiner got a confusing wherether that applicant recited duplicate claim language or recited "anotherr a depression...through hole.", Also, applicant argues that Uno ('604) under the rejection of 102 or 103 of the limitation of "through holes having...substantially flat surface" are improper. Examiner disagrees. Uno discloses a through hole (7) having an inner wall (the wall to form an opening 11, see figure 4) substantially filled up with a plating layer having at least one surface (the layer 6 as shown in figure 5 filled up a surface of an opening 11) to form a via hole (which is a via or hole)...